DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 626 SP 009 696

AUTHOR Moriarty, Dick
TITLE Integrate or Disintegrate!
PUB DATE 9 Jun 75
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Canadian Association of University Athletic Directors (University of Victoria, B.C., Canada, June 9, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Programs; *Athletics; Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Programs; *Physical Education
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

This address cites studies, reports, and conferences having to do with the integration of physical education and athletics in Canadian universities. Some of the things the speaker notes are that (1) most Canadian colleges are integrated, and those that are not wish they were; (2) most researchers recommend integrating sports and offering them in conjunction with a physical education or health department; (3) more nonintegrated sports programs than integrated programs lost funding in recent years; (4) more integrated programs than nonintegrated offer 11 or more sports; (5) more money is spent on integrated programs than on nonintegrated programs; and (6) American sports programs, the majority of which are nonintegrated, are in bad shape financially despite their size and image. The speaker suggests that integrating Canadian sports programs offers the best hope of continuing Canada's excellent intercollegiate sports program. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115626

INTEGRATE OR DISINTEGRATE!*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by
Dick Moriarty
Professor & Director of Sports
University of Windsor

Colleagues. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss with you the pros and cons of integration or non-integration of physical education and athletics. I must admit that when George Short called me I hesitated to speak on this topic since:

1) I have no strong biases one way or the other.

2) I have little to add beyond the presentation which I made at last year's joint CAUAD/NACDA meeting.

3) I had a previous engagement to speak at Atlantic City to the Mental Health Division of the American Medical Association on Windsor's SIR/CAR work in youth sports.[1]

4) Quite frankly, I am bored with this topic (as I am sure most of you must be).

George Short has a way of being rather persistent, however, and suggested that he was certain that I could:

1) Develop a bias if I thought about the topic.

2) Comment on developments which have transpired since last year's CAUAD/NACDA meeting.

3) Send Jim Duthie to Atlantic City.

4) Come up with some interesting points on this non-interesting topic.

*Address to the Canadian Association of University Athletic Directors at the CAUAD meeting held at the University of Victoria, B.C., Monday, June 9, 1975.

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I made the mistake of telling George that I would think about it over the weekend. On Monday morning I received in the mail a letter from Vic Pruden informing me:

1) that he appreciated my ready willingness to address the CAUAD.

2) that I would be talking on the prose and cons of integration or non-integration of physical education and athletics.

3) that I would be positive and affirmative in the debate which he was arranging between myself and Ed Zemrau.

I somehow have the feeling that George Short and Vic Pruden have "led me down the garden path." Colleagues, beware if you get calls or correspondence from Montreal in the East and Winnipeg in the West!

You will be pleased to hear that I have avoided the tendency to philosophize, but have chosen rather to dwell only briefly on antecedents and subsequently focus on current transactions and future projections.

Antecedent Activities

Numerous meetings, seminars, symposiums, studies and research projects have been conducted to investigate and legislate on the question of integration or non-integration of physical education and athletics. Listed below are some of the more noteworthy examples:

1) 1966 - In Toronto the famous Inn-on-the-Park Conference was held which resulted in the AUCC-CAHPER recommended policies and standards decreeing what ought to be. Dalt White was the chairman of the athletic committee which made a strong statement for integration.

2) 1973 - Barry Mitchelson conducted a comprehensive research study in conjunction with his dissertation from Ohio State University entitled, "Analysis of the Relationship of Programs of Physical Education and Intercollegiate Athletics." Barry Mitchelson's dissertation and subsequent involvement as associate researcher with Dean Mathews on the joint AUCC-CIAU Study on Athletics in Canadian Universities, dealt with what is in terms of integration and non-integration. Both documents show that most universities on the Canadian scene are integrated and those that are not wish that they were.

3) 1971 - Juri Daniels, Director of the School of Physical Education at the University of Toronto, in conjunction with doctoral studies at the University of Illinois, studied the question of "Differentiated Roles and Faculty Satisfaction in Departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Canadian Universities." The results of this study, which are available through Earle Zeigler's recently published text, Administration in Physical Education and Athletics, both attest to the fact that there is increased satisfaction in integrated as opposed to non-integrated programs. In a telephone conversation last week Juri Daniels pointed out to me that those involved in physical education and athletics at the University of Toronto favoured integration; however, this move was blocked by the University of Toronto.

4) Jacques Burrelle in a recently completed doctoral study on "Qualification of Athletic Directors in Member Institutions of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union," found that there was higher general education and higher professional development in Canadian universities (which for the most part are integrated) as opposed to American universities (which for the most part are segregated).

5) Just this year Wayne MacDonald, a Master of Physical Education student at the University of Windsor, extended a longitudinal study which I had conducted between 1965 and 1970, dealing with the Ontario Universities Athletic Association. Results showed an increase in integration in the OUAA.

6) Keith Harris, in his master's thesis at Springfield College completed in 1972, dealt with the question of "Delegation of Authority by Athletic Directors." Among other things, his study showed that athletic departments which are integrated exceed athletic departments which are non-integrated in (a) staff - 26.2 > 21 and (b) full-time and joint appointments - 18.7 > 7.5; however, athletic directors in non-integrated programs exceed athletic directors in integrated programs in span of control and delegation. In other words, athletic directors in non-integrated programs are delegators and athletic directors in integrated programs are doers, at least in the view of their superiors.

7) Dean Arnold Whitney Mathews, in his bench mark joint study of Athletics in Canadian Universities, which was conducted for the AUCC-CIAU, reported strongly in favour of integration with a sports department including service, intramural and intercollegiate integrated with a department, school or faculty of physical and health education.

8) Individual university commissions agreed that integration > non-integration for both school and sports (McMaster - 1962; Waterloo - 1963; Windsor - 1965; Guelph - 1967; Queen's - 1969; York - 1971; Brock - 1970; Laurentian - 1971; Ottawa - 1973; and Toronto - 1973).

Research and development at the national and Province of Ontario level suggests integration of sport or athletics into physical and health education. Regrettably, similar data for the Atlantic Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Quebec Universities Athletic Association, Great Plains Athletic Conference and the Canada West Athletic Association are not readily available; however, input at national meetings, as well as the samples available, indicate that for the most part most medium and major universities (except Simon Fraser and Lakehead) desire and/or are integrated.

In summary, the philosophic, historic and pragmatic analysis = integration of sport or athletics into physical and health education.

Current Transactions

The most meaningful and fruitful area of study is to be found in current transactions and future projections (particularly in hard times of inflation). More specifically, analysis of budgets for academics and athletics and their coorelation with school sports programs is probably the most fruitful area for current and future analysis. We can anticipate a growth, development and decline pattern in Canada similar to that in the United States. Focusing on physical analysis, the most valuable extant data readily available to me was (1) updated material from Barry Mitchelson; (2) Dean Mathews's published report and private correspondence; (3) Nobby Wirkowski-Bryan Kealey data on a current study in the Ontario Universities Athletic Association; (4) Keith Harris-Bob Pugh data on the recently completed CIAU financial study; (5) the OUAA Media Guide and the Blue Book of Athletics; and (6) Bob Barney's Focus on Philosophy and Finance of Canadian University Athletics.

Barry Mitchelson's data indicates that integrated programs exceed non-integrated programs in the following way:

1) In terms of men's intercollegiate athletics, 71% of the integrated programs offer eleven or more sports as compared with 51% of the non-integrated programs which offer ten or fewer sports.

2) In terms of women's programs, 66% of the integrated programs offer seven or more sports (and indeed 26% offer eleven or more sports) as constrasted with 100% of the non integrated which offer ten or fewer sports.

3) In terms of revenue, integrated programs depend upon the general university funds and the budget of physical and health education whereas the non-integrated programs depend upon student fees and alumni contributions.

4) In terms of expenditures, integrated programs exceed non-integrated programs in terms of both the direct and indirect absolute expenditures upon the area of sport (service, intramural and intercollegiate).

Keith Harris and Bob Pugh conducted a survey during the past year covering thirty-eight institutions in the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union with a total of 12,500 athletes. The study showed that the following expenditures occurred:

1)	Administration	$ 7,963,000	
2)	Programs	$ 7,096,000	
3)	Others	$ 8,875,000	
	Total	$23,935,000	
	National Office	$ 75,000	Administration
		$ 100,000	Program
		$24,110,000	

Clustering of universities on the basis of expenditures results in a typology with three clusters:

Cluster A = those universities expending approximately $1,250,000 such as British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Western Ontario, Waterloo, Toronto, McGill and York.

Cluster B = those universities expending approximately $725,000 such as Calgary, Saskatchewan, Lakehead, Winnipeg, Guelph, McMaster, Queen's, Ottawa, Sir George Williams, Carleton, Loyola, Montreal, Laval, Dalhousie, New Brunswick, and Windsor.

Cluster C = those universities expending approximately $125,000 such as Victoria, Regina, Lethbridge, Brandon, Laurier, Brock, Ryerson, Trent, Royal Military College, McMaster, Trois Rivieres, Bishop's, Sherbrooke, Quebec, CMR, Memorial, Prince Edward Island, St. Mary's, Acadia, St. Francis Xavier, Moncton and Mount Allison.

Ontario Budgets

The Nobby Wirkowski-Bryan Kealey study of operating expenditures in the Province of Ontario shows a total of approximately $725,000 excluding facilities and equipment. Integrated universities are expending $97,690 on an average, while non-integrated universities are expending $73,084.

Closer scrutiny of the trend analysis in the Province of Ontario in the past four years destroys the myth that in hard times it is preferable to be non-integrated as opposed to integrated. Over the past four years a total of forty-two teams have been discontinued in the universities of the OUAA!

Only seven teams have been lost in integrated programs, while a total of thirty-five have been lost in non-integrated programs! This means that the opportunity for young university men to participate in intercollegiate athletic programs has been reduced from 3,081 opportunities to 2,844 - a net loss of 237 educational sport experiences. In integrated programs only ten educational sport spots have been lost over the past four years, while in non-integrated programs a total of 227 students have been denied the right to participate in an intercollegiate program. This trend is alarming and should receive the immediate and undivided attention of all athletic directors in Canada. Regrettably, on such short notice figures were not available for the other four associations of the CIAU, but I think that statistics would be quite similar.

The difficulties we are encountering on the Canadian scene are similar to those in U.S. universities. Recently in the Detroit News Don Canham was quoted as saying

> American athletics are in trouble. Seven hundred of 800 U.S. athletic programs are in the red. By 1980 it is highly likely that we will have an exclusive golden twenty universities such as Michigan, UCLA, Notre Dame and Ohio State competing in football and conducting extensive athletic programs. This super conference isn't a solution but the result of a disaster!

Similar expressions of concern have been expressed by Dr. Robert Atwell, President of Pitzer-Pomona College and Chairman of the American Council of Education committee studying the financing of university intercollegiate athletics in the United States. In private correspondence, and subsequently in his public report to ACE, he pointed out that "a five to ten year projection indicated the collapse of American intercollegiate athletics unless drastic changes are made in the financial base." Dr. Atwell suggested chipping away

of grants-in-aid of education with the ultimate goal of eliminating athletic scholarships.

Initially, this presentation was entitled "To Integrate or Not To Integrate Physical Education and Athletics, That is the Question?" Halfway through the research I decided to change the title to "Integrate or Non-Integrate?" Ultimately I came to the title which you see at the head of this paper, "Integrate or Disintegrate!"

It has been overemphasis not underemphasis that has caused the collapse of intercollegiate sport in Canada. We are constantly talking about something distinctly Canadian. We have it in Canadian intercollegiate sports programs. Let's hope we don't lose it without ever appreciating it!